

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14, 15 and 17-19 remain pending in the instant application. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14, 15 and 17-19 presently stand rejected. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 7-10 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,043,481 (hereinafter Tan) in view of Assadi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,166,369 (hereinafter Assadi), further in view of Chang et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0147105 (hereinafter Chang), and further in view of Uchiyama et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,621,637 (hereinafter Uchiyama).

When combining prior art elements to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the M.P.E.P. emphasizes that the "key" to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear *articulation of the reasons(s)* why the claimed invention would have been obvious. M.P.E.P. § 2143. Thus, the Examiner must provide clear articulation of the reasons in support of a § 103 rejection. The April 29, 2011 Office action at page 5 attempts to provide a reason for the combination of Uchiyama with Tan, Assadi, and Chang in support of the § 103 rejection of Applicant's claim 1:

One would have been motivated to do so because as Uchiyama teaches in Col. 4, lines 11 - 27, to provide a transmissive screen which provides excellent resolution and which does not have reduced image quality due to moiré.

However, Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the reasoning provided in the April 29, 2011 is erroneous for at least the reasons provided below.

Applicant's claim 1 expressly recites an "image sensor," which is entirely different from the transmission screen of Uchiyama (See, the television, monitor, etc. of Uchiyama's FIG. 11). As described in col. 2, lines 14-19 of Uchiyama, the diagonal size of the transmission screen can be equal to or greater than **50 inches**. As would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, the size of an image sensor is much smaller than 50 inches. For example, a typical image sensor is normally less than **one inch**. Uchiyama further describes at col. 15, lines 8-12 that inkjet recording heads are

used for discharging drops of lens composition to form the lens for the transmission screen. As would be further understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, microlens sizes for an image sensor are equal to or less than the size of the image sensor pixel which is normally **10 microns or less**. An inkjet recording head, as described by Uchiyama would not be able to form a microlens less of 10 microns or less (e.g., a 720 dpi inkjet recording head would only have an approximately 35 micron resolution). Thus, the reasoning provided by the Examiner of "to provide a transmissive screen which provides excellent resolution..." is simply not true. That is, the proposed combination would not provide "excellent" resolution. In fact, Applicants submit that the proposed combination with Uchiyama's transmission screen would render an image sensor unsatisfactory for its intended purpose because of the size limitations of the lens on Uchiyama's screen.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the 103 rejection of claims 1-3, 7-10 and 14 fails to clearly articulate a valid reason for the proposed combination with Uchiyama. Furthermore, the proposed combination with Uchiyama would render one or more of the prior arts unsatisfactory for their intended purpose (see M.P.E.P. 2143.01 V). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the instant § 103 rejections of claims 1-3, 7-10 and 14 be withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan in view of Assadi, further in view of Chang, further in view of Uchiyama, and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

Claims 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan in view of Assadi, further in view of Chang, further in view of Uchiyama, and further in view of Nakai, U.S. Patent No. 5,396,090 (hereinafter Nakai).

Claims 15 and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan in view of Assadi et al., further in view of Chang, further in view of Uchiyama, and further in view of Engelhardt et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,387,773 (hereinafter Engelhardt).

None of the remaining cited references, including "Applicant's admitted prior art", Nakai, nor Engelhardt cure the above noted deficiencies of the proposed combination of Uchiyama as suggested in each of the rejections. Thus, Applicant

respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections of claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 15, and 17-19 also be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the applicable rejections have been overcome and all claims remaining in the application are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at (206) 292-8600 if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Please credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: June 29, 2011

/Andrew J. Cameron Reg. #50281/

Andrew J. Cameron
Reg. No. 50,281
Phone: (206) 292-8600